REMARKS

The Office Action dated April 29, 2008 issued by the Examiner and the citations referred to in the Office Action have been carefully considered. Claims 1-19 are pending. Applicants have amended claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 10, 12, 13, 17, and 19 for clarification purposes and not for any reason regarding patentability. Further, no new matter has been added in view of this amendment. In addition, Applicants have cancelled claims 3, 4, 14, and 15 without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants reserve the right to pursue these claims in continuation, divisional, and/or continuation-in-part patent applications.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action rejected claims 1-7, 10-17, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. U.S. 2005/0028208 to Ellis et al. ("Ellis") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0087580 to LaCroix et al. ("LaCroix"). Applicants submit that these rejections should be withdrawn in view of the arguments discussed below.

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the multicasting parental control configuration is utilized to disable receipt of an objectionable media object in **real-time**. The Specification explains that the software for the current configurations "doesn't necessarily provide a parent the ability to monitor a child's actions in real time." See Specification, paragraph [0005]. As a result, a parent with a current configuration is limited to preempting future viewing and can do nothing about objectionable content that a child is currently viewing. To accomplish this real-time disablement, claim 1 utilizes a multicasting configuration so that the monitoring device can send a leave command to remove the remote device from the multicasting group. Accordingly, if a child is halfway through watching a program that is objectionable, the parent can immediately stop the remaining half of the feed of the program from reaching the child's viewing device.

The combination of Ellis and LaCroix would at most allow a parent to block, not disable the feed of the media being viewed by the child. In particular, Ellis teaches that "[t]he remote access program guide, for example, may provide users with an opportunity to block potentially objectionable programs or channels using a parental control code (e.g., a personal identification number (PIN) code)." See Ellis, para. [0120]. Placing a parental code on a media object still allows that object to be received, i.e., a program can still be viewed if the parental code is entered. If a child obtains the parental code, the program can be viewed. Claim 1 eliminates any possibility of the child viewing the media object once the leave command is issued. Further, Ellis does not explain whether the implementation of the parental code could be utilized in real-time, e.g., for a program that is already being viewed by child, or a future program. Therefore, the combination of Ellis and LaCroix does not teach "providing, from the monitoring device, a leave command to the host device to remove the remote device from the multicast group if said media object is objectionable so that receipt of said media object by said remote device is disabled in real-time" as recited by amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Additionally, an additional benefit to the operation of offering the real time disabling of the received feed (by causing one to leave a multi-cast feed), is that the proposed combination of Ellis with LaCroix works from the operation of a program guide, where one controls a system by remotely accessing a program guide (not the program being transmitted in real time itself). That is, a program guide from Ellis with LaCroix will be the point of control which provides the user ability to block a program or not, where such a blocking operation will depend on the listing in a program guide, in which a parent will use either ratings information or detail about a program to decide whether a program to be broadcasted into the future should be blocked or not.

In contrast, the present invention, by allowing a real-time "leave" command from a multi-cast group allows for a parent to take control of the claimed system in environment where a system may had unrated material (as with many feeds available through the internet) or such material may not be part of a program guide. The system of Ellis with LaCroix requires that a program guide listing be somewhere in order for a blocking operation to take place, where such program guide listings are to be created by a broadcaster or a third party like Gemstar. The present invention operates differently that

the Examiner's combination of Ellis with LaCroix in that the present invention operates on a real-time transmission which is directly monitored by a parent (when the parent joins the multicast transmission of what the child would be watching in real-time). This operation of the present invention therefore is different than the Examiner's combined system of Ellis with LaCroix.

Claims 3 and 4

Claims 3 and 4 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Therefore, Applicants submit that the rejections of claims 3 and 4 should be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 5-7 and 10-11

Applicants have amended claims 2, 5, 6, and 10 to clarify the language and address minor formalities.

Claims 2, 5-7 and 10-11 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for similar reasons to those discussed with respect to claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit that the rejection of claims 2, 5-7 and 10-11 should be withdrawn.

Claim 12

Amended independent claim 12 is allowable because claim 12 recites "a network interface that issues a query requesting identification information for a media object being multicasted through a multicast group to received on a remote device from a host device, joins the multicast group with multicast information received in response to said query to receive said media object, and provides a leave command to the host device to remove the remote device from the multicast group if said media object is objectionable so that receipt of said media object by said remote device is disabled in real-time." As discussed above, the combination of Ellis and LaCroix does not teach such a recitation. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the rejection of claim 12 should be withdrawn.

Claims 13, 16-17, and 19

Applicants have amended claims 13, 17, and 19 to clarify the language and address minor formalities.

Claims 13, 16-17, and 19 depend from claim 12 and are allowable for similar reasons to those discussed with respect to claim 12. Therefore, Applicants submit that the rejection of claims 13, 16-17, and 19 should be withdrawn.

Claims 14-15

Claims 14 and 15 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Therefore, Applicants submit that the rejections of claims 14 and 15 should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action rejected claims 8, 9, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Ellis in view of LaCroix in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0078441 to Drake et al. ("Drake") and in view of "Request for Comments 3266; Updates 2327, Network Working Group, June 2002," published by Olson et al. ("Olson").

Claims 8 and 9

Claims 8 and 9 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for similar reasons to those discussed with respect to claim 1. Therefore, the rejection of claims 8 and 9 should be withdrawn.

Claim 18

Claim 18 depends from claim 12 and is allowable for similar reasons to those discussed with respect to claim 12. Therefore, Applicants submit that the rejection of claim 18 should be withdrawn.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's objections and rejections, it is believed that this patent application is in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's attorney at (609) 734-6809, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

Respectfully submitted,

R. Blair et al.

/Joel M. Fogelson/
Joel M. Fogelson
Reg. No. 43,613
Phone (609) 734-6809

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing Inc.
Two Independence Way
Suite 2
Princeton, New Jersey 08540
August 29, 2008